

III. REMARKS

1. Claims 1, 7, 15, 16 and 17 are amended.
2. Claim 16 is amended to correct the informality noted by the Examiner. The change is not narrowing and not made for reasons related to patentability.
3. Claim 7 is amended to correct the antecedent basis error noted by the Examiner.
4. Claims 1, 4-6, 8 13 and 16 are not anticipated by Chang under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

Claim 1 is amended to recite that *a first message is sent from the terminal to the network for allocating the radio resource for the packet switched implementation of a realtime service; the first message comprising specific information indicating that a radio resource is requested for a realtime service, and that the network allocates to the terminal a radio resource of a type, which is well-suited for the packet switched implementation of the realtime service.* This is not disclosed or suggested bby Chang.

Chang relates to an arrangement which enables real time interactivity for packet switched sessions (col. 1, lines 65 to 67). Chang presents, in addition to the control channels that are used to set up sessions, another logically and physically separate and independent set of control channels that can be used as session control channels. The session control channels are advantageously continuously on during both inactive and active periods of session. (Col. 2, lines 7 to 15.) For the uplink, Chang's new control channel includes Fast Packet Access Channel (F-PACH) and optionally other control channels. For the downlink

the new control channel includes the Fast Packet Access Grant Channel (F-PAGCH) for one embodiment and for other embodiments the F-PAGCH and the Fast Packet Access Polling Channel (F-PPCH) (col. 5, lines 5 to 11).

In Chang it is stated that conventional access procedures are unnecessary and unsuitable for access during an ongoing session (col. 4, lines 51 to 53). For initial access for realtime sessions Chang uses basic MAC procedure, that is, basic prior art technology. And for access during ongoing sessions Chang uses the new session control channels for transition to active state from an inactive state (col. 7, lines 43 to 57).

In Applicant's invention, as recited in claim 1, a first message is sent from the terminal to the network for allocating the radio resource for the packet switched implementation of a realtime service; the first message comprising specific information indicating that a radio resource is requested for a realtime service, and the network allocates to the terminal a radio resource of a type, which is well-suited for the packet switched implementation of the realtime service. That is, the network cannot freely decide what kind of resource is allocated.

Chang, on the other hand, does not disclose any message comprising specific information for indicating that a radio resource is requested for a realtime service. Chang does not teach a specific allocation message for requesting resources for realtime services. Chang only mentions that an "open ended" TBF is requested while initiating a realtime session (col 7, lines 49 to 50) (TFI identifies TBF that is requested; col. 3, lines 62 to 63). Chang does not specify how the network responds to such a request for an "open ended" TBF. As described in Applicant's invention, (page 6, lines 19 to 26), the network is not obliged

to allocate the exact resource that is requested. Thus, in Chang it is not certain whether the network allocates the resource that was requested.

Therefore, claims 1 and 15 are not anticipated by Chang. Claims 4-6, 8, 13 and 16 should be allowable by reason of their respective dependencies.

5. Claim 2 is not unpatentable over Chang in view of Spartz (US 5,878,036) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claim 2 should be allowable at least by reason of its dependency on claim 1. Furthermore, Spartz relates to a novel and improved method and apparatus for providing wireless telecommunication service using CDMA "over-the-air" interface in conjunction with a GSM A-interface protocol interface (col 1, lines 10 to 17). This does not overcome the deficiencies related to Chang noted above. Thus the combination of Chang and Spartz cannot disclose or suggest Applicant's invention.

6. Claims 3, 9-12, 14 and 17 are not unpatentable over Chang in view of Widegren et al. ("Widegren") (US 6,374,112) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claims 3, 9-12, and 14 should be allowable at least in view of their respective dependencies since Chang does not disclose or suggest each feature of Applicant's invention. All of the features of claim 17 are not disclosed or suggest by Chang for the reasons stated above.

Furthermore, Widegren does not overcome the deficiencies of Chang, and the combination of the two references does not disclose or suggest each feature of Applicant's invention as claimed. Widegren merely provides flexible radio access and

resource allocation in a UMTS (col. 1, lines 9 to 13). Thus, these claims should also be allowable.

7. Claim 15 is not unpatentable over Chang in view of Erjanne (US 6,490,271). Claim 15 recites indicating that a radio resource is requested for a realtime service for identifying the message on the basis of said information, in the network as a radio resource request for the packet switched implementation of a realtime service. This is not disclosed or suggested by Chang or Erjanne. Erjanne introduces a solution for controlling data transfer over the air interface. In the solution, the user data to be transmitted over the air interface is monitored, and based on the properties of this data e.g. the number of time slots allocated for the connection is controlled. (Col. 2, lines 54 to 57.) However, neither Chang nor Erjanne disclose a message for allocating a radio resource for a packet switched implementation of a realtime service, the message comprising specific information for indicating that a radio resource is requested for a realtime service. Thus, claim 15, and the claims that depend therefrom should be allowable.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record, and are in proper form for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.